

REMARKS

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed June 10, 2004. With the cancellation of Claims 7-9 and the addition of Claims 44-46, Claims 1-6 and 10-46 are presented herewith for consideration.

I. Summary of the Examiner's Rejections

Claims 7-9, 12-14 were rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention

Claims 7-9 were rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential steps, such omission amounting to a gap between the steps.

Claims 12 and 13 were considered indefinite by the office because they are functionally equivalent to claims 10 and 11, and encompass the same scope.

Claim 14 mentions a third electronic content.

Claims 1-20, 22-33, and 35-42 were rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,163,779 to Mantha et al. (Mantha).

Claims 21, 34, and 43 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mantha as applied to claims 2, 22, and 35, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,581,065 to Rodkin et al. (Rodkin).

II. New Title

The Examiner indicated that the title of the invention was not descriptive. Applicant respectfully submits that reverse proxy mechanisms in general are known in the art for

efficient handling of network requests from locations outside of the network. Nevertheless, applicant has amended the title to be further descriptive of the invention.

III. Rejection of Claims 7-9, 12-14 Under 35 USC 112, Second Paragraph

Claims 7-9 have been rejected under 35 USC 112, Second Paragraph, on the grounds that essential steps were omitted. The Examiner interpreted the Claim 7 as being unclear as to whether the link was wrapped once or twice. Applicant respectfully submits that the claim as filed was clear that it is wrapped only once. It is respectfully submitted that it would be clear to one of skill in the art that the claim does not require a first wrap, and then a second wrap if it is determined that a second wrap is required. It is respectfully submitted that one of average skill in the art would understand that the first wrapping step recited in Claims 7-9 is carried out only if it is determined that the first wrapping step is required. Nevertheless, applicant has canceled Claims 7-9 from the application, and it is respectfully requested that the rejection of Claims 7-9 on these grounds be withdrawn.

Claims 12 and 13 were rejected under Section 112, Second Paragraph, as being functionally equivalent to Claims 10 and 11. However, Claim 10 requires that the step of inserting a reference to the network device in the modified link be included as part of step (d) of Claim 2. By contrast, in Claim 12, while the inclusion of a reference to the network device in the modified link may occur in step (d) of Claim 2, it is not so limited. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 12 is not functionally equivalent to Claim 10. Claim 13 is also respectfully submitted to be definite by virtue of its dependence on Claim 12, which as indicated above, is not functionally equivalent to Claim 10.

Claim 14 has been amended to clarify that the recited address is for a second electronic content.

IV. Rejection of Claims 1-20, 22-33, and 35-42 Under 35 USC 102(e)

Claims 1-20, 22-33, and 35-42 were rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Mantha. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection as follows.

Mantha relates to a system for copying an html document and embedded objects/links from a network server onto a hard drive of a client device. As stated in Mantha:

It is a primary goal of the present invention to provide a method for copying or "saving" a Web page onto a local storage to enable a user to browse the page at a subsequent time. (Col. 1, lines 60-65).

The browsing at a subsequent time refers to pulling the copy of the saved web page from the client's local hard drive. Mantha is clear that, once the page is copied, the page is accessed from the local hard drive, not from the network server. Subsequent browsing of the page occurs on the client side, from the copy stored on the client side hard drive, thus accomplishing the stated purpose of Mantha which is speedier access to web pages. Mantha states:

when the user later brings up the copied page, the page comes up immediately as the normal client pull operation to the server is avoided. (Col. 2, lines 19-21).

And again later on:

At step 50, the copied Web page 49 is retrieved from the local hard drive and displayed on the browser. This operation is performed without pulling the Web page from the computer network. (Col. 9, lines 33-37).

At the end of this operation, there is a new HTML page with links for images pointing to files on the local hard drive. When the user desires to retrieve the copied page, a link to the pointer is activated. The saved page comes up essentially instantaneously because all the images are on the hard drive and no network access is required. (Col. 12, lines 30-35).

Thus, Mantha is directed to saving time by storing a copy of a webpage on a client hard drive, thus eliminating the time intensive-need to access a network server.

By contrast, the present invention addresses a different problem and solves that problem in a different manner. As set forth in the Background of the Invention section, electronic content on a network often includes hyperlinks that are accessible, or resolvable, when accessing the hyperlink from within the network, but, due to security and other reasons, are not resolvable outside of the network. The present invention is directed to allowing access to non-resolvable hyperlinks within electronic content that is downloaded from a network to a non-network linked client device. It does not solve this problem by storing all of non-resolvable hyperlinks and associated content on the client device as in the cited reference, but rather the information remains on the network server, and the network server still must be accessed to download the hyperlinked information. However, the present invention changes the non-resolvable address in the downloaded electronic content, to an address on the network which may be resolved from outside of the network.

This feature appears in the claims and the claims have moreover been amended to more clearly recite this feature of the invention. For example, original Claim 1 recites in part:

receiving at a server on a local network, a request for delivery ...of electronic content that is associated with the local network, wherein the electronic content includes one or more links *that are only resolvable within said local network*;

retrieving the electronic content from within the local network;

generating updated content by modifying the one or more links associated with the electronic content *to include information identifying said server...*

(Emphasis added). Mantha nowhere discloses or teaches that there are links that are only resolvable within the local network and Mantha nowhere discloses or teaches that the modified links include information identifying the server on the local network.

Similarly, each of Claims 2-6, 10-20, 22-23 and 35-42 recite in part:

- (b) retrieving said first electronic content from said network;
- (c) identifying a link within said first electronic content;
- (d) wrapping said link to obtain a wrapped version of said link *that identifies a resolvable address on the network*

(Emphasis added). As stated, the feature of wrapping a link from electronic content, where the wrapped link identifies a resolvable address on the network is nowhere taught or suggested by Mantha. In fact, Mantha teaches away from such an invention. The stated goal of Mantha is to store a copy of a webpage and embedded objects/links on a client hard drive to avoid the time-intensive need to access a network. Thus, one of skill in the art would not read Mantha as anticipating or rendering obvious an invention which involves accessing a network after an initial download as in the present invention. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection of Claims 1-6, 10-20, 22-23 and 35-42 on Section 102 grounds be withdrawn.

V. Rejection of Claims 21, 34, and 43 Under 35 USC 103(a)

Claims 21, 34, and 43 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mantha, and further in view of Rodkin. However, each of Claims 21, 34 and 43 depend on Claims 2, 22, and 35. As set forth above, Claims 2, 22 and 35 recite features nowhere taught or suggested in Mantha. Namely, Claims 2, 22 and 35 each recite wrapping a link to identify a resolvable address on the network. Rodkin adds nothing to the teaching of Mantha in this regard. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 21, 34 and 43 are each patentable over the cited references, taken alone or in combination with each other. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection of Claims 21, 34, and 43 on Section 103 grounds be withdrawn.

VI. New Claims

Applicant has added new Claims 44-46. New Claims 44-46 each recite in part the steps of determining whether a link can be resolved outside of a network, and wrapping the link if it cannot be resolved outside of the network. These features are nowhere disclosed, taught or in any way suggested in the cited references, taken alone or in combination with each other.

Claim 46 further recites the steps of checking for non-resolvable links within the wrapped link. Again, this feature is nowhere taught or suggested in the cited references, taken alone or in combination with each other.

Based on the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration of Claims 1-6, and 10-43, and consideration of Claims 44-46, is respectfully requested.

The Examiner's prompt attention to this matter is greatly appreciated. Should further questions remain, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney by telephone.

Enclosed is a PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for extending the time to respond up to and including today, October 20, 2004.

The Commissioner is authorized to change any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 501826 for any matter in connection with this document.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 20, 2004

By: 

Brian I. Marcus
Reg. No. 34,511

VIERRA MAGEN MARCUS HARMON & DENIRO LLP
685 Market Street, Suite 540
San Francisco, California 941105
Telephone: (415) 369-9660
Facsimile: (415) 369-9665